



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,735	12/21/2001	Timo Elomaa	367.40942X00 5096	
²²⁹⁰⁷ BANNER & W	7590 05/14/2007 VITCOFF, LTD.	EXAMINER		
1100 13th STREET, N.W.			SANDOVAL, KRISTIN D	
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051		ī	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Assistant Commence	10/023,735	ELOMAA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kristin D. Sandoval	2132			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/18/07. This action is FINAL. This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-40 are subject to restriction and/or example.	vn from consideration.				
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/al Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 10. 	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square objector drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite			

Art Unit: 2132

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

In view of the appeal brief filed on January 18, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A restriction is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Gilberto Barron Jr.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-5, 9-11, 15, 19-24, 27-28 and 38-40, drawn to group I, classified in class 726, subclass 5.

Art Unit: 2132

- II. Claims 6-8, 18, 25 and 35-37, drawn to group II, classified in class 726, subclass7.
- III. Claims 12-14, 16 and 29-30, drawn to group III, classified in class 726, subclass 27.
- IV. Claims 32-24, drawn to group IV, classified in class 726, subclass 31.

 The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions groups I-IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination of group II as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination group I as claimed because although the combination teaches the use of an indicia indicative of a level of control, the use of indicia is common and well known in the art and in no way shows the specifics of the content distribution control system of group I is the system used to create and assign the indicia in the subcombination claimed in group I. The subcombination has separate utility such as creating content with an indicia for use in a network.

The combination of group II as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination group III as claimed because although the combination teaches the use of an indicia, the use of indicia is common and well known in the art and in no way states generating a list of allowable operations as stated in subcombination group III, nor does it include the specifics as to the system in which the indicia is assigned to the content, as stated in combination group II since subcombination group III only deals with receiving content that includes indicia.

Application/Control Number: 10/023,735

Art Unit: 2132

The subcombination has separate utility such as allowing specific control of the type of operations allowed on a certain content that includes the indicia.

The combination of group II as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination group IV as claimed because although the combination teaches the use of an indicia, the indicia in combination group II is used to determine a level of control on the content whereas the indicia used in subcombination group IV pertains to the control of the distribution of the content, thus the indicia does not require the particulars of the combination group II. The subcombination has separate utility such as controlling how the content is distributed.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the

inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Conclusion

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37) CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/023,735

Art Unit: 2132

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

examiner should be directed to Kristin D. Sandoval whose telephone number is 571-272-7958.

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kristin D Sandoval

Examiner

Art Unit 2132

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 6

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100